

THE CATHOLIC MIND
Vol. XXXIII, No. 14, July 22, 1935.

Rationalists and Utopiasters

MOST REV. RICHARD DOWNEY, D.D.
ARCHBISHOP OF LIVERPOOL

A lecture delivered in Brisbane, Australia, as published in The Southern Cross (Brisbane) on January 25, 1935.

IF the thirteenth century stands out as the golden period of philosophic thought, and the seventeenth as heralding the dawn of the physical sciences, undoubtedly the present age is the heroic age of science. When we consider the marvelous scientific inventions and discoveries that have marked the progress of this century there can be no doubt that this is an age of science. The time spirit of the age, its general drift and trend, is always reflected in the religious aberrations of the period, and consequently we find there is at present a tendency to glorify science; to make of science a religion, to hail science as the savior of the human race.

I want you to realize when I say this that I am not alluding to real scientists, because they are usually men who are remarkable for their reverence and humility. They themselves do not make extravagant pretensions. During this century they have reacted against the materialism of the nineteenth century. Many of them have stressed the fact that man is not a sort of physical mechanical organism, and that there are spiritual and impenetrable elements in man which are important in the life of the world. Unfortunately in the wake of the real scientists you have the "popularizers" the gentlemen who write little books on the subject, and turn out snappy articles for the Sunday papers, the gentlemen who skim the surface of great themes, and, for some reasons best known to themselves are mostly anti-religious.

THE MILITANT ATHEISTS

You have the militant atheists who have a large supply of such lightning and thunder—mostly thunder—and then you have the agnostics and also the learned agnostics, all of them curiously enough with anti-religious bias. They differ amongst themselves in their shades of unbelief and disbe-

lief, but their method is very much the same, and most of us who have given any attention to the matter are thoroughly familiar with the method. Their method is simplicity itself. Their pugnacious statements against religion are usually camouflaged by some introduction such as "Science (with a capital S) tells us" or "Science (with a capital S) teaches us," and then follows some amusing statement which has no ground whatever from a scientific point of view. That is the usual method. This kind of thing has had an unsettling effect on the minds of men and women who are trying to coördinate the old methods of thought with the new. It has had unexpected results in certain quarters where one is astonished to find it.

We have in England those who are throwing over traditional beliefs of Christianity in an attempt to be thought up to date in scientific opinion. We have in England one prominent ecclesiastic whose dismal utterances not infrequently contribute to the gaiety of nations. He never tires of assuring his hearers or readers that there is a continual war between science and religion, and that religion is getting the worst of it, and to these gloomy utterances his pontifical brother at Birmingham answer "Amen, so be it."

THE PROVINCE OF SCIENCE

Is there a war between science and religion? I venture to say that there is not. There can be no conflict where there is no contact, and there is no contact between the province of science and the province of religion. In fact, between the province of science and that of religion you have another vast province, the vast province of philosophy. There is even no conflict between the province of science and the province of philosophy. Consider the province of science! The whole of science is description. The astronomer describes the heavenly bodies as he sees them; the botanist describes the plants and flowers as he finds them; the geologist describes the earth as it is. It is always description. Scientists themselves stress this very point. Carl Pearson, for instance, says: "The whole of science is description," and he says that science explains nothing. Then Professor Wheathan says that "Science is concerned with establishing general laws which describe the sequence of

phenomenon in all cases." Sir Oliver Lodge said: "Science is description; science is the metrical knowledge of phenomenon, and in regions where there is no measure and no description there is no science."

Science never explains any terms of purpose or deep-down meaning. Science is description; philosophy is explanation. How can there be any conflict between sane science and sound philosophy? Truth is not at war with itself. Science and philosophy were planned harmoniously in their spheres by the Creator of the universe, and the din of contending parties exists only in the minds of people who have misconceived the function of science, or misconceived the function of religion, or, as not infrequently happens, misconceived the functions of both.

METHODS OF THE RATIONALISTS

To show you how the war between science and religion is worked out we will take a specific example, and I would point to Professor Bury and his history, the "Glory of Thought." He is a rationalist. In his little book which has been published in a popular edition in the Home University Library Series, you will find amazing statements. On page 180 he says: "There is a war between science and religion," and then by way of illustration he points to the conflict between the Biblical record as to the antiquity of man and the scientific record as to the same antiquity, and then, with that charming inconsequence which so distinguishes Rationalists, about ten pages further on, he makes it clear that there is no Biblical record as to the antiquity of man. He says: "The English divine of the XVII century ingeniously calculated that man was created on October 23rd in the year 4004 at 0 'clock in the morning, and no Biblical records can put the date any further back." What his Biblical records turns out to be is the ingenious calculations of an Anglican divine. The calculation was made by Dr. Lightfoot, who was Vice-Chancellor of the Cambridge University. He added together the ages of the Patriarchs of the Old Testament, and gave the sum total as the date when the first man appeared on the earth. Of course, there is not so complete a record of the Patriarchs of the Old Testament as there is of the Kings of England.

SUBSTITUTING DESCRIPTION FOR EXPLANATION

The most popular method of attacking Christianity is the substitution of description for explanation. If you are ever called upon to explain something and you cannot do it, I would recommend you to adopt the Rationalist method. All you have to do is to enter into a long description of how you think it came about, and nine people out of ten are satisfied you have explained the matter. H. G. Wells is a perfect adept at this kind of thing. His book, "The Outline of History" is a masterpiece of inaccuracy. It reminds me of Dickens who said that the lady of fashion had not got any outline. There are about twelve chapters telling you how everything developed out of nothing. But if you have any intelligence you will see that it is all description, not a word of explanation. He starts by describing the primordial nebulae, and describes how it evolved itself into worlds and finally produced life—all description—with the aid of photographs. And you would imagine that Mr. Wells had occupied a front seat at the entertainment.

"Why am I here in the world at all today?" you might ask yourself. According to Mr. Wells, you represent the survival of the fittest. "How did that come about?" "Because there was a struggle for existence." And you want to know how that came about, "Through natural selection." And if you ask about natural selection you are told that natural selection is a law—like Mohammed's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth, and having relation to neither. It is to tell us something that is supremely obvious. We want to know who made the law and why. We want explanation, not description. The history of the human race on its intellectual side is the history of the inquiry which man is forever instituting into the meaning and nature of its surrounding.

ETERNAL QUESTIONING

A little child can ask as many questions in five minutes as most of us can't answer in five hours. Sometimes, perhaps a Sunday afternoon, you have seen a boy going with his father for a walk. All the way along the boy asks questions: "What is this, and what is that, father?" and his father if he is wise says: "Ask your mother." He can-

not answer those questions himself. Men and women are only children of a larger growth. They love to ask questions—especially women—and a period comes in the lifetime of all of us when we ask the fundamental question of all: "Where did I come from?" When a child attains the use of reason it wants to know "Where did I come from?" The child realizes that it was not brought by the stork, or found under a mulberry bush. It realizes after a time that it came from its parents. It then wants to know where its parents came from, and so on back to Adam and Eve. The child is then told that Adam and Eve were created by God.

But that is not so with the modern Rationalist child. The Rationalist child wants to know where it came from. It is told it came from its parents, they from their parents, back to Adam and Eve. "Where did Adam and Eve come from?" And the child is told that in the course of millions of eons Adam and Eve developed from anthropoid apes. The child wants to know where those apes came from and it is told that in the course of more millions of eons they developed from primitive lemurs. The child asks: "And where did they come from?" and it is told that in the course of more millions of eons they developed from jelly-fish. That is getting on to surer ground now. The child knows something about jelly-fish. It asks: "Where did the jelly-fish come from?" and it is told that they came from a protoplasm. And the child wants to know where did the protoplasm come from, and it is told that is developed from an azoteprotoplasm. That ought to keep any child quiet. But the child wants to know where did "them" come from, and he is told that it developed itself—rather a tame ending to the story. And the poor Rationalist child is left with an indefinite chain of causes and not a single link in the chain can account for itself or anything else, and so even the child mind realizes there is something outside the whole series which must have brought it into being, and which all men call God.

RATIONALISTS BEGIN WITH NOTHING

The Rationalists tell us that they will present us with a thrilling drama entitled "From Microbe to Man" with the aid of the lantern slides. They say: "Only give us enough time and we will show you how to get nearly everything

out of next to nothing." First of all the very long time has nothing to do with the matter. If I tell you that something took a very long time you get the idea that the whole process is in some way mechanical, and that is exactly what they want to convey. As a matter of fact, the progress of a pedestrian by inches from Brisbane to Melbourne would argue volition on his part just as if he flew from Brisbane to Melbourne in an airplane. The length does not affect the question.

There is an old axiom that out of nothing you get nothing, and its corollary states that out of next to nothing you get next to nothing. But why should these gentlemen start with next to nothing? We say that God made the world out of nothing. They are setting out to make a rival world. Mr. Wells started with primordial nebulae. He is simply picking the pocket of the Almighty. If these Rationalists will start fair, with nothing, I think you will find that their recipe for the universe would be like this recipe for fishing nets: Take a number of holes and tie them together with string.

MIND AND MATTER

The difficulty is to begin. If these gentlemen will begin properly with nothing they will end with nothing. They say they have the religion of the open mind. The open mind is a synonym for the empty head. Their chief difficulty is to show how mind developed out of matter and that is a great difficulty indeed. I have read one prominent Rationalist on the subject and he takes refuge in the usual device of illustration. He says the intelligence of man developed out of matter just as the oak tree out of the acorn or the diamond out of carbon. These are wonderful illustrations, but they do not illustrate; otherwise they are all right.

If the Rationalist wants to illustrate he ought to show us an oak tree developing out of carbon and a diamond developing out of an acorn and then he would be getting on. But his illustrations are of no particular value. John Stewart Mill said: "Mind and matter are poles apart and every attempt to bridge the gulf has failed." That reminds me of a boy who was being examined by his professor. He was asked, "What is mind?" and he said, "No matter."

Then the professor asked him, "What is matter?" and his answer was, "Never mind." I am sorry to say that boy did not pass the examination.

To ask what is the distance that separates mind from matter is about as sensible as asking how far is it from the Brisbane City Hall to the middle of next week. The question does not mean anything. It is nonsensical. Mind and matter are not in the same street. The fundamental property of matter is extension. A knife has extension; a brush has extension. The knife cannot cut itself or the brush brush itself because of its extended parts. I cannot see my eye with my eye, not that I want to, because the eye is an extended organ. With my mind it is quite different. I can see my mind with my mind. I can think of myself and I can think of myself thinking of myself. Consequently mind is immaterial. But out of a purely material thing like matter you cannot develop something absolutely immaterial. That is the chief difficulty of the modern evolutionist.

DARWINISM DEAD AS THE DODO

Until recently Darwinism was put forward as the full and satisfactory explanation of how man evolved from the low brute forms and matter. In scientific circles Darwinism is as dead as the Dodo. But not so with the "popularizers," who are fifty years behind the times and thoroughly up to date. At Cambridge University they published a book to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the publication of the "Origin of Species" by Charles Darwin. I have read it. It was contributed to by leading evolutionists of the day—Weisman, De Bries, Bateson, Thistleton-Dyer and Haeckel. And would you believe the one thing that was most hotly discussed was natural selection. There was not a single one who contributed to its compilation who accepted it and Bateson said: "The time has not yet come when we can even discuss it." But with the "popularizers" it is quite another matter. With them Darwinism still flourishes. It is curious to read the story of the search for missing links. There was a period in my boyhood when missing links were a table topic.

In 1909 Professor Schwarb declared that Darwinism was proved up to the hilt. This was hailed with delight by the Rationalists and the Materialists, and Professor Schwarb

was rejoicing in the discovery of the pithecanthropus, the monkey man. Mr. Wells published a photo of one. I want to assure you that that picture is a very marvelous achievement on the part of Mr. Wells. I have congratulated him on the achievement, because all that was ever found of the pithecanthropus was a skull, a piece of a thigh bone and two molar teeth. Not only that, but these remains were not found together and then the anatomists came in and said they did not believe that they belonged to the same skeleton. The thigh bone was purely human and the others not. The geologists examined them and said they were not as old as they said they were. That was the end of the missing link. But it still figures in the work of the Rationalist "popularizers."

VIEWS OF THE FUTURE

Not only do they look back to the ancestry of men, but they look also to the time when men will be like gods, what the world will be like 2,000 years hence. It will be the age of Utopias. But philosophers and metaphysicians are of small account.

The present is the age of the Utopiasters. I admire them because of their undaunted courage. They remind me of a cock crowing to herald a false dawn. No matter how many other false dawns he has heralded, he meets a new one with all the old enthusiasm. He is never discouraged. You always find the same thing with these Utopias. The fundamental assumption of all these gentlemen is the perfectibility of human nature. They assume that by science you can eliminate man's passions and prejudices. By science men will love each other, there will be no injustice, and everything will be perfect. This is nonsense. Whatever else has changed, the nature of man has not.

Cotter Morison says there will be no evil in the world. The penny catechism will tell you that men are prone to evil. Science won't eliminate your passions. That has to be done by discipline of mind and temper. These modernists set forth marvelous views of the future. They say that owing to the progress of science there will be no gaols, no madhouses, no Customs House officials—they are very strong on this point—no cheats, no gamblers, no liars, no murderers. Nevertheless, they say, there will be no diminution of romance or adventure—and all that, for 1/6. What is the

panacea that is going to bring this about? What is the marvelous remedy? Simply the religion of science and the service of man, of Cotter Morison. Cotter Morison admitted that multitudes had put off the Fatherhood of God and they had not put on the brotherhood of man. Huxley thought that by preaching humanity you would make men better.

The average man is not interested in posterity. He is much more concerned about the "bitter here and now" than the "sweet by-and-bye." He wants something to remedy his present discontents. In all these Utopias not only have you not this marvelous explanation of how man is to become perfect, but there is a morality that is going in the opposite direction. I think it is the old immorality with a slight veneer of respectability. In the old days they knew they were doing wrong, but now the new morality wants to provide some sort of pseudo-ethics of giving reign to your passions. And they regard the Ten Commandments as a candidate sitting for an examination would regard the ten questions on an examination paper: "Only five of the following questions to be attempted." They will tell you that the Ten Commandments are out of date, and they will say that they apply only to the enlightened.

THE BIRTH CONTROLLERS

What strikes me about it is that they only apply it to sex indulgence. They do not apply it to theft and murder. And they give as their reason the principle of expediency. It would be expedient to remove certain objectionable people altogether. It would enable you to develop your self-expression to push them off. But you will find their theory applies only to sexual indulgence. Surely this gospel of selfishness demonstrates the binding force of the eternal, the natural and positive law of God.

A lot of people would be reformers, birth controllers, life controllers and death controllers. They will control anything except themselves. I am not going to offend your tastes by referring tonight to birth control, but let me point out one fact. The Government Actuary of Great Britain, working in conjunction with the Education Department, has pointed out that in thirteen years' time from now there will be 1,000,000 children less in the schools of

England than there are today, and advised the Government to provide less schools. We are becoming a vanishing race. The life controllers are the people who are very keen about the survival of the fittest and nobody else. Who are the fittest? The fittest for what? It is a very deep question with many ramifications. We know very little about eugenics. All this artificial interference with the laws of nature is perfectly unwarranted, and runs counter to the principles of morality.

THE DEATH CONTROLLERS

And now for the death controllers. Osler mentioned that when a man was forty he was of no use and that he ought to walk into the lethal chamber. But when Osler was forty he raised the age to fifty. And when he was fifty he raised the age to sixty. However, unfortunately, he died. If these gentlemen had a little more sincerity we might attach more importance to what they say. Their theory may be summed up in a verse:

"Brothers I am sixty-one,
Useful time on earth is done,
Peace should follow after storm,
Hand me down the chloroform."

But instead of their wanting to die, they come to us with both hands out asking for monkey gland extract.

The plain result of it all is that these things are better left alone. We know little about them.

You have had moral decadence time and again. It blotted out the glory that was Greece, and it will ruin the might of our own Empire unless we return to sound principles of morality and realize that the old Faith is of more importance than all the new faith of scientific learning.

Delusions of Atheism

MONSIGNOR FULTON J. SHEEN, D.D.

An article published in the first issue of Wisdom, the official publication of the Trinity League, New York, in May, 1935.

THE philosophical appeal of a new God is at bottom nothing but a form of atheism. There are two ways of being an atheist: one is to say, "There is no God"; the other is to say, "We need a new idea of God and that God is Space Time, or the ideal tendency in things." One of the things I could never understand about this second kind of atheism is how certain minds could admit that the universe is God—I mean Christ. Another thing equally difficult to understand is how certain humanitarians could say that God is the society of millions and millions of persons living today, and yet deny that there could be three persons in God—I mean the Trinity.

The denial of God is really not a doctrine; it is a cry of wrath. If atheism means a denial that this universe demands a cause of its being, whatever it be, there are probably few atheists, if any. One of the most famous atheists of modern times, M. Le Dantic, says that "many call themselves atheists without knowing what they mean." Some call themselves atheists when their atheism does not mean the denial of a cause, but only the ignoring of it. With others, atheism is identified with the law of the universe—as if there could be a law without a lawmaker. But it is extremely doubtful if there are any who deny God in the sense that their denial would imply that the universe caused itself. Such a position is rationally impossible, for if the universe caused itself, it would need to have pre-existed itself, in order to bring itself into being—which is nonsense.

One may therefore justly speak of the theism of atheism, for the denial of God asserts in some way His existence. Suppose I began circulating the country with pamphlets fighting the belief in fairies, and ghosts, and goblins, and cows that jumped over the moons; suppose I wrote books against three-legged centaurs, and against ghosts that floated like Ivory soap; suppose I used the radio to warn the Ameri-

can public against the Sandman who sprinkles sand in the eyes of children after nine o'clock. What would be the reaction of the general public? They would probably lock me up as a madman and a public nuisance—and rightly so, because I would have proved beyond doubt that I was insane, for what is insanity but a belief in the figments of the imagination?

Now suppose that God, as the atheists hold, is no more real than these centaurs and fairies; suppose God belongs to that same queer and weird group of fancies as the three-legged ghost. Now I ask, why it is that society would consider me insane if I spent myself and was spent in the campaign against cows that jumped over the moon, and yet would not consider the atheist insane, because he carries on a campaign to prove that God belongs to that same class of fancies and imaginings?

The reason is obvious. The atheist is not mad; he is not insane. What I would be fighting against would be reality—something as real as the thrust of a sword or an embrace. A man is mad who imagines a fancy to be real, but the atheist is not fighting against a fancy that he imagines to be real, but a reality that he takes to be a fancy. In other words, what saves the atheist from the stigma of insanity is the fact that he is fighting the Reality by which all things else are real. Foch was not insane when he took gray uniforms at Rheims to be the uniforms of an enemy; it is the objectivity of the enemy that makes the attack sane and sound, and it is the objectivity of the enemy of atheism that saves atheists from being mad, though it does not save them from being sad. That is why one may speak of the theism of atheism.

Certain things are so fundamental that to deny their existence is to assert them. For example, if I deny that I exist, I imply my own existence, for I have to exist before I can deny my own existence. The denial implies an affirmation, and in a still more general way, the denial of the Principle of all existence implies the existence of that Principle. If there were no wines or liquors we would never have prohibition. The very fact that there is a league against saloons—the Anti-Saloon League—implies the failure of prohibition and the existence of saloons, or at least speak-easies. If there were never any cigarettes there would never be any anti-cigarette laws, and if there is no God, how can

there be atheism? Does not atheism imply something to "atheate"?

The only reason in the world for loving life and love and truth is because they come from God, and if they do not come from God then there is no good reason for loving them. The very same reasoning process that makes other things intelligible is that which makes God intelligible, who is the source of abiding values and realities. Our great minds of today turn their telescopes on Mars and see there something that faintly resembles canals. They then argue: there are canals on Mars, but only an intelligent being can make a canal; therefore Mars must be inhabited by men. Now, I cannot understand for the life of me why if it is logical to conclude to a canal-builder, from the sight of a canal, it is not logical to conclude to a Universe-BUILDER from the sight of the universe.

Other minds there are who turn over the blistering sand of the Egyptian desert, discover a few tombs and relics, and then from that paltry evidence reconstruct the nature of the civilization of those days. Now if this is logical—and it is logical—why should not those same minds infer something of the Justice, the Goodness, and the Beauty of God from the vestiges of those things found here in this universe? If, too, there are minds in the world who believe that the universe is guided by purpose, why should they not admit God, for how can there be purpose without a mind, and how can there be mind unless it be a Person?

No! A godless universe cannot exist, for it cannot bear the sorrow of not knowing its Author and its Cause; nor can a godless humanity exist, for it cannot bear the burden of its own heart. That is why I always feel sorry for the atheist: he never can say "Good-bye" (God be with you) to his friends.

Modern Aversion to God

REV. JAMES M. GILLIS, C.S.P.

As published in Wisdom (New York) in the issue of May, 1935.

THE greatest of all Phobias is Theo-Phobia, the fear or the dread of God, aversion against God, the determination to explain all things without God, or since that is impossible, to leave all things unexplained rather than admit God as the explanation.

It is really funny to see the twisting and turning, the dodging and shifting to which one must have recourse, if one has eliminated God. There is an old story about Napoleon's asking a scientist (was it Laplace?) who was explaining to the emperor some scientific theory, "But where does God come in according to this theory?" And the answer, "Sire, I have no need of that hypothesis." As it turned out—upon investigation—the legend was only a legend with no truth whatever in it. But if it were true, Napoleon might have retorted, if he were as good a thinker as he was a soldier, "You need some hypothesis. If you don't take God, you will have to take another. If you take another and make it do duty as God, you may as well call it God. God by any other name will still be God."

Clark Maxwell, the greatest physicist of the nineteenth century, used to say, "I have read many systems of philosophy and of science purporting to dispense with God, but I have always detected a God concealed somewhere." True enough. When they get rid of God they resort to Chance, with a capital C. But any good scientist would tell you there is no such thing as chance.

So, to explain the origin of the solar system and of the entire universe, they lugged in the theory of the "Fortuitous Concursus of Atoms." But that was only a verbal trick. "Fortuitous" means "accidental," and accident means chance. And chance is out.

Likewise, to explain the origin of life on the planet they invented "Spontaneous Generation." That was supposed to take the place of God the Life-Giver. But along came Pasteur and proved that Spontaneous Generation does not occur, never did occur and never can occur. Thereupon some pseudo-scientific charlatans tried to masquerade Spon-

taneous Generation under its Greek name Abiogenesis. And for a time certain half-educated dabblers in science accepted Abiogenesis as God. They might just as well have bowed down before Tezcatlipoca or Quetzalcohuatl. As a matter of fact, those Aztec deities had more existence than Abiogenesis.

So, one after another substitute for God was tried and rejected. In the poem of Carruth—an attempt to set science to rhythm and rhyme—occurs the familiar line, "Some call it evolution, others call it God." A good enough line, but extremely bad science. Evolution at best is only a Process, and God is the Power back of the Process.

Later we have had Bergson's Elan Vital, borrowed and translated by Bernard Shaw, as "The Life-Force." But we had a Life-Force long before that. The name God is better than Elan, so why change? Last of all comes the hyphenated "Space-Time," which is called upon to do the work of God. But who wants to say, "O Space-Time, I adore Thee. O Space-Time have mercy on me?"

Well then, what's the matter with all these persons? What ails them? Theo-Phobia. Anything to get rid of God. But when they get rid of God, they have to get another one in His place, as Voltaire told them. The only one who can fill the place of God is God. So I think we had better leave well enough alone. Theo-Phobia is a disease—a mental disease, like all other Phobias.

How to Be Happy—Though Religious

JOHN E. McANIFF

*A Talk delivered over WLWL, the Paulist Radio Station,
New York, on May 3, 1935.*

THERE is not a living human being who is not filled with a burning desire to be happy. It is one of the strongest yearnings in human nature. How can it be satisfied? Very easily—if you rely upon all the advertisements you see and hear.

Are you broken in health? Simply buy a bottle of Dr. Jones' "Concentrated Vitamins," and even though your nerves have been shattered in the vain attempt to provide

a home for your family, you will soon enjoy the vigor, if not the intelligence, of an intercollegiate football star.

Would you be wealthy? Simply save a certain percentage of your yearly income and your financial worries will disappear. "It isn't what you earn," the billboards say, "it's what you save." You are not supposed to ask how you can save anything when you don't earn enough to educate your children—but you can't say that on a signboard at Forty-second Street and Fifth Avenue.

Are you seeking wisdom? Solomon received his wisdom from God but the ABC Institute says it can do the job very well in ten easy lessons, which you can take personally or by mail.

Those are the things, you are told, that you must do if you wish to be "healthy, wealthy and wise." But no clever advertiser tells you that when you have done those things you will be happy. He leaves the implication to you. He knows that your mind will leap like lightning to the conclusion that you *will* be happy if you can have the things on which your heart is set.

But life is not so simple. Many people cannot afford to buy "Concentrated Vitamins," or to save money, or to take courses. Other people can afford such things but soon find that they have been fooled again, and they will probably spend their lives reaching for the moon. A fortunate few do get what they want but when they have reached the moon they long for brighter and larger and more distant planets.

But is there no happiness? Must we all spend our lives striving for things which will be given to only a favored few? Is it the fate even of those few to find that milk and honey must turn to ashes on their lips?

Where can we find the answers to those questions?

Is it not reasonable to say that God, who gave us that intense desire for happiness, must have told us somewhere how to satisfy that desire? Is it not also reasonable to say that the place where we will find that information, which is so vitally important to our temporal and eternal welfare, is in the Church which He established to teach all nations?

The Catholic Religion is based upon eternal happiness. There would be no Catholic Church if God had not promised us complete happiness in the future life. Since that is so,

it is the duty of the Church to tell us how to obtain eternal happiness, and it is also her duty to tell us how to obtain happiness in this life insofar as it affects happiness in the future life. It is true that this life is merely a period of trial. We can, however, obtain a reasonable amount of happiness while on this earth although true happiness can be had only in the future life.

What is the Catholic program of happiness? A moment ago I spoke of being healthy, wealthy and wise. Those three qualities represent the sum of many of our desires. If everybody possessed health, wealth and wisdom, there would at least be much more contentment and less misery in the world. What does the Catholic Church do to make the people of the world healthy, wealthy and wise?

It makes them healthy by teaching them what their bodies are. In every Catholic Church there is an altar, on every altar there is a tabernacle, and in every tabernacle is God. That tabernacle, because of the presence of God within it, is a sacred thing. No civilized person would think of disfiguring it, of destroying it, or of mistreating it in any way. But the human body is also a tabernacle because it contains an immortal soul which makes every living man and woman like God. Therefore the body is to be revered; it is never to be disfigured or maimed or destroyed. On the contrary, there is a solemn duty to use all reasonable means to preserve health and life. I shall give you two practical examples of the application of that doctrine: 1. The first hospitals of which we have any record were really religious houses devoted to the care of the sick and infirm; 2. In almost every Catholic mission, you will find a well-equipped dispensary in charge of a nun or a brother who is a practical nurse, a frontier doctor. Thus we see that the Catholic Church not only teaches health but even administers to the sick when there are no other agencies to perform that work.

What does the Catholic Church do to make people wealthy? The answer is nothing. It does not try to make people *wealthy* because God has said that it is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle than it is for a rich man to enter heaven. It does, however, try to obtain a more just distribution of the goods of this world so that every person will have enough money and enough property

to entitle him to live in reasonable and frugal comfort. The present Pope has spoken fearlessly and boldly on that subject and has asserted the right of every person to a just share of material goods. I quote from his Encyclical, "On the Reconstruction of The Social Order": "Each class, then, must receive its due share, and the distribution of created goods must be brought into conformity with the demands of the common good and social justice, for every sincere observer is conscious that the vast difference between the few who hold excessive wealth and the many who live in destitution constitute a grave evil in modern society."

What does the Catholic Church do to give people wisdom? That question can be completely answered only by a resumé of the history of the last 1,900 years. But confining ourselves to the present—there are Catholic schools, colleges and universities. The present Pope has assumed the intellectual leadership of the world by applying the wisdom of the ages to the three great problems of the day,—education, marriage and the social order. The Catholic Church is the one institution in the world with a unified system of thought which shows not only that there is no conflict between God's word and man's reason but also that man's reason must sooner or later lead to an acceptance of God's word.

Those are a few of the principles which the Catholic Church lays down in order that people may obtain some happiness upon this earth. But we all know that many unfortunate people have very little happiness during their lives. What of those who have never had the pleasure of possessing and enjoying the good things of this world? What of those who have spent their lives in an agony of pain? What of those who have been ridiculed for deformities of body and mocked for infirmities of the mind?

For such of God's creatures—in fact, for all people, even those who love life and consider it a joyous experience—the Catholic Church offers a very definite program. It is the program which was offered to the repentant thief dying on the cross: "This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise."

That is the real program of the Catholic Church for her plan of happiness on this earth is merely incidental to her great plan of happiness in the next world.

Has it ever occurred to you that there are only two reasons why people are not happy in this world? The first

reason is that they don't get what they want. The second reason is that when they do get what they want they are not satisfied with it. And has it also occurred to you that those two reasons, which prevent us from being happy on this earth cannot possibly interfere with our happiness in the future life?

There is no possibility of not being completely and intensely satisfied with what we are to have in heaven because we will have something which is without any flaw or imperfection whatever and which is a combination of all the beauty and perfection which we have ever known or dreamed of. Dissatisfaction will be impossible because we will be joined to the source of all satisfaction. We will be united with God.

But, you may say, just as I strive hard for something in this world and fail to obtain it, so I may strive hard for Heaven and fail to get there. That also is impossible if you strive with all the power that God has given you, because the only thing required for entrance into Heaven is a sincere attempt on your part to obey as well as you can the rules which God has asked you to observe. Eternal happiness, like everything else, is not to be had merely for the asking. On the other hand, if we try with all our strength to do what we should do, no power in the world can prevent us from getting our reward.

Getting to Heaven is not like getting the things of this world. You may miss happiness on this earth through no fault of your own. You may be born with a suffering body or lose your health through accident or disease, over which you have no control. You may be unable to amass a fortune because of the faithlessness of friends, or you may lose all your possessions because there is too much rain and your wheat crop is destroyed. You may be unable to give an education because you were left an orphan or because others depended for their very lives on your meager earnings. All those things may happen because of circumstances beyond your power.

But nothing is beyond your power in getting to Heaven. Nothing can prevent you from keeping the rules which will get you there. All you have to do is to try with all your strength to do as God wants you to do.

And how will you know what God wants you to do?

By going to the teacher whom God has appointed and by following the instruction and the guidance of that teacher, who is the Catholic Church. Under that instruction and guidance you will learn that there is a reasonable amount of happiness on this earth which we may or may not get, but that there is an unlimited amount of happiness in the next world which will be ours if we try, to the best of our ability, to live as God wants us to live. If we do that we are certain that nothing can prevent us from hearing the words: "This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise."

That is the Catholic doctrine of happiness—and a most reasonable doctrine it is. Contrast it with the doctrine of Clarence Darrow, who has recently said: When I die—as I shall soon—my body will decay. My mind will decay and my intellect will be gone. My soul? There is no such thing."

That statement is full of absurd contradictions. The author says he has a mind and an intellect but that he has no soul. But if there is no soul there can be neither mind nor intellect because both mind and intellect are merely different faculties of the soul. It would be just as consistent for the author to say that he has hands and feet but no body. The unreasonableness of that pessimistic statement is its own condemnation.

On which of the doctrines will you base your struggle for happiness?

The unreasoning pessimism of Clarence Darrow: "My soul? There is no such thing."

Or the reasonable words of One who taught that man has a soul which is destined for a complete happiness: "This day thou shalt be with Me in Paradise."